

AGENDA: March 23, 2004

5.1

CATEGORY: Public Hearing

DEPT.: Community Development

TITLE: Planned Unit Development Permit—
203-233 Granada Drive

RECOMMENDATION

1. Review the Initial Study of Environmental Impact and approve the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. Adopt A RESOLUTION CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR A 20-UNIT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT WITH A 0.55 FAR AT 203-233 GRANADA DRIVE, to be read in title only, further reading waived.
3. Adopt A RESOLUTION CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A TENTATIVE MAP TO SUBDIVIDE TWO EXISTING LOTS TOTALING 76,956 SQUARE FEET INTO 20 RESIDENTIAL LOTS AND ONE LOT FOR A COMMON DRIVEWAY, GUEST PARKING AND COMMON LANDSCAPED AREA AT 203-233 GRANADA DRIVE, to be read in title only, further reading waived.

FISCAL IMPACT

A BMR in-lieu fee of 3 percent of the sale price of each unit would be paid to the City upon the close of escrow of each unit. Based on the expected sale price of \$600,000 for each of the 20 units, this would result in a total one-time payment of \$360,000 to the City (\$600,000 x 0.03 x 20 units = \$360,000).

BACKGROUND

Project Description

The applicant, Granada Park Townhomes, LLC, is requesting a Planned Unit Development Permit and Development Review approval to construct 20 new townhouses at 203-233 Granada Drive (see Attachment 1—Location Map). The site would be subdivided into 20 townhouse lots with one common lot for access, landscaping and other amenities (see Attachment 2—Site Plan). The applicant is requesting a floor area ratio (FAR) of 64 percent (49,169 total square feet or 2,458 square feet per unit), where 55 percent (42,325 total square feet or 2,116 square feet per unit) is permitted. The two existing properties contain a total of

nine residential units and are surrounded by a mix of residential units to the north, west and south, and light industrial uses to the east.

Application History

The applicant originally applied for a Variance for a 64 percent FAR. This request was denied at the February 25, 2004 Zoning Administrator hearing based on the following findings: (1) there is nothing unusual about the physical characteristics of the lot that prevents 20 townhouse units from being developed which would comply with the City's FAR maximums for townhomes, and the 0.55 FAR would not deny the property owner the ability to develop 20 townhomes of a reasonable size; and (2) approval of the Variance would create a special right or privilege for the applicant not enjoyed by other property owners with similarly zoned properties and would set a precedent for future townhome development projects throughout the City.

The applicant withdrew the Variance request after the Zoning Administrator hearing, noting that they believed the request for the increased FAR could be approved as part of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) permit application. The applicant maintains that the City has the discretion to approve a PUD permit with an increased FAR (see Attachment 5—Letter from Applicant's Attorney and Architect).

However, Section A36.58.010 of the City Code states that "the design, configuration and impact of the proposed PUD project shall be compared to the General Plan, the purpose and standards of the applicable zone district and any other applicable standards and design guidelines." The proposed 64 percent FAR exceeds the maximum 55 percent FAR allowed for townhouses in the R3 Zoning District. The proposal cannot be approved as submitted through the PUD process. A Variance or a text amendment of the City's code for townhouses are the only two methods by which the City can grant approval of this request.

General Plan and Zoning

The General Plan designation for the subject site is Medium-Density Residential (13 to 25 units per acre). The proposed townhouse development is consistent with several of the goals listed in the City's General Plan, including providing new ownership housing opportunities and allowing a variety of residential unit types within the City.

The site is zoned R3-1.5 (Multiple-Family Residential). The permitted uses within the R3-1.5 Zoning District include apartments; townhouses; small-lot, single-family developments; and condominiums. The Zoning Ordinance specifies different development standards for each of these permitted uses since they are different building types. For example, townhouses are typically two-story attached units with individual front doors,

private yard areas and attached garages. Apartments are typically three- to four-story structures with individual units on each floor. Apartments typically contain shared exterior hallways which provide access to each unit, shared parking and access areas, and shared open space areas.

In the 1980s, prior to adoption of the Townhouse Guidelines, townhouse developments were built in the City using R3 standards originally intended for apartment projects. This resulted in townhouse projects which were too bulky, lacked sufficient open space and had insufficient landscaping along driveways and at the front doors of units. Following a review of recently built townhouse projects, the City adopted townhouse development standards in 1989 which addressed these issues and provided standards which differed from the R3 standards typically used for apartment projects. As a result, townhouses are permitted 55 percent floor area and are required to maintain 45 percent of a site as open area, which is primarily in private yards. Apartment projects, in contrast, are permitted an FAR of 1.05 since apartments are typically built as three- to four-story buildings and can, therefore, accommodate a higher FAR and still provide adequate open space to buffer their increased size.

The project substantially complies with the development standards listed in the City's Design Guidelines for Townhouse Developments ("Guidelines"), except for FAR. The proposed project meets all setback, height, open space and parking requirements. Below is a discussion of the significant issues related to the proposed development.

DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

Floor Area Ratio

Section A36.12.040(K) of the City's Zoning Ordinance states that new townhouse developments shall conform to the R3 Zoning Ordinance standards, which include FAR, density and lot coverage requirements. Previous PUD applications for townhouse projects in the City have consistently met these quantitative standards. The Zoning Ordinance also notes that townhouse developments shall be reviewed in the context of the City's Design Guidelines for Townhouse Developments. These Guidelines, as applied through a PUD application, allow some flexibility in terms of site planning, setbacks, amenity areas and unit design. However, PUD applications for new townhouses still must meet the underlying R3 Zoning Ordinance standards such as FAR, density and lot coverage.

Since the proposed 64 percent FAR exceeds the maximum allowable 55 percent FAR, the City's Zoning Code does not permit approval of the project as submitted. A townhouse project with an FAR greater than 55 percent can be considered only through a Variance application or text amendment of the City's Zoning Ordinance. A zone text amendment

request would be subject to the Gatekeeper Ordinance and Environmental Planning Commission and City Council review, and any approved zone text changes would impact how future townhouse projects are developed in the City.

In order to comply with the maximum allowable 55 percent FAR, each unit, which includes a two-car garage, would need to be reduced from approximately 2,458 square feet to 2,116 square feet, still a very adequate size.

Site Plan

The Development Review Committee (DRC) reviewed the project and noted the positive aspects of the site plan, which include a common open area that retains a Heritage redwood tree, a tot lot, picnic benches, landscaping and guest parking (see Attachment 2—Site Plan).

The proposed site plan also includes 10' long driveway aprons which complies with the Townhouse Guidelines. The Townhouse Guidelines state that driveway aprons should be no more than 10' long so that residents will not be tempted to use them for parking and block the common driveway, or should be at least 20' long to accommodate a parked vehicle. Additionally, all of the proposed units, except one, include two-car garages. The project includes 52 parking spaces which meets the required parking standards for townhouses of 2.6 spaces per unit.

Project Design

The DRC also noted that the proposed 64 percent FAR results in a design with bulk and mass impacts and recommended that a project with a 55 percent or less FAR would help reduce these impacts. The DRC provided the applicant with the following design recommendations:

- **Townhouse Design:** The large roof form of each building group, in addition to the proposed 64 percent FAR, contributes to an overall project more closely resembling an apartment building instead of a group of individual townhouses (see Attachment 3—Elevations and Perspectives). Greater differentiation between each unit is recommended.
- **Granada Drive Elevations:** Buildings A and E, which face Granada Drive, should include a front door that is visible from the street. These units should be designed so it is clear that the Granada Drive elevation is the front of each unit (see Attachment 4—Granada Drive Elevation).

The applicant submitted plans which included a revised roof form that helps separate each unit and additional windows on the Granada Drive elevation. However, the DRC

recommends that the project return to the DRC for further design review following Council consideration in order to fully address the two remaining design issues noted above.

Environmental Issues

The potential environmental impacts of the proposed project were analyzed in an Initial Study dated January 2004 (see Attachment 8—Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration). Several potentially significant impacts which could affect surrounding properties were identified. These include noise, air quality and construction impacts. To reduce these potential impacts to less than significant levels, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposed conditions of approval. A Mitigated Negative Declaration is, therefore, recommended for this project.

Additionally, soil samples taken at the southern property line indicated a minor amount of residual chemicals from diesel and motor oil. The concentration of chemicals found is far below the threshold set forth by the California Regional Water Quality Board and does not trigger any required mitigation and monitoring of the site by any oversight agencies. However, the City determined that it would be appropriate to minimize any potential adverse affects of exposure of future residents to these chemicals by requiring that a qualified soils engineer be present during grading activities in order to provide appropriate soil remediation recommendations at that time. This has been added as a condition of approval to the project (see Attachment 10—Resolution and Conditions of Approval).

Heritage Trees

A total of 13 Heritage trees exist at the property, and 12 are proposed for removal. The subject trees were evaluated by the project's arborist and then by the City's Arborist who recommends that these 12 trees be removed due to either their general health, danger of limb failure or because they interfere with the required driveway access or building locations.

The most significant Heritage tree is a redwood located near the middle of the site. This tree is proposed to remain and will complement the proposed common open area and landscaping.

Subdivision Design

The Subdivision Committee reviewed the proposal for a Tentative Map (see Attachment 9—Tentative Map) to subdivide this property on March 1, 2004. The Committee found the project to be consistent with the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and General Plan. The project as proposed meets all standards for street design and site configuration.

HOUSING IMPACT

Relocation Plan

The proposal includes the demolition of nine residential units. To address relocation concerns regarding existing tenants at the site, the applicant submitted a tenant relocation plan which was incorporated into the environmental review and analysis of the project. This relocation plan includes accepted City standards such as a 90-day noticing period instead of the standard 30-day period of most rental lease contracts and a full refund of each tenant's security deposit. Rental listings were also made available to tenants at the site.

PUBLIC INPUT

Letters

An existing tenant at the subject site, Verne Robinson, submitted several letters regarding the proposed project (see Attachment 7—Letters from the Public). Planning staff provided Mr. Robinson with responses to his concerns through several letters and provided updates on the project to him by phone. Several City departments also provided additional research, site visits to the property and responses to his questions and concerns.

Zoning Administrator Hearings

Several members of the public spoke at public hearings on February 11, 2004 and February 25, 2004. Their general questions and comments concerned the justification for a Variance for additional FAR, height limits, parking requirements and fencing for the proposed project (see Attachment 6—Zoning Administrator Minutes).

CONCLUSION

The proposed project is consistent with the Subdivision Map Act and General Plan and is in substantial compliance with the City's Design Guidelines for Townhouse Developments. The site plan is well-designed and provides a common landscaped area with amenities such as a tot lot and a picnic area.

However, the proposal exceeds the 55 percent maximum allowable FAR for townhouses, which results in a design with bulk and mass impacts. Staff recommends that the City Council approve the PUD permit (see Attachment 10—Resolution for Planned Unit Development Permit) and Tentative Map (see Attachment 11—Resolution for Tentative Map) but also recommends that the project's FAR be reduced to a maximum of 0.55 as allowed under the R3 Zoning District. This would result in each unit being reduced from 2,458 square feet to 2,116 square feet. Staff also recommends that the project be referred to the Development Review Committee (DRC) for additional design review.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Direct the applicant to apply for a Zone Text Amendment to modify the allowable FAR permitted for townhouse developments. This will be subject to the Gatekeeper Ordinance and would require consideration by the Environmental Planning Commission and City Council.
2. Deny the project and direct staff to prepare findings for denial of the PUD.

AGENDA: March 23, 2004

PAGE: 8

PUBLIC NOTICING

Agenda posting, noticed the local newspaper and mailed to all property owners within 300' of the subject property.

Prepared by:

Martin Alkire
Associate Planner

Approved by:

Al Savay
Planning Manager (Acting)

Elaine Costello
Community Development Director

Kevin C. Duggan
City Manager

MA/5/CAM/891-03-23-04M-E^

Attachments: 1. Location Map
2. Site Plan
3. Elevations and Perspectives
4. Granada Drive Elevation
5. Letter from Applicant's Attorney and Architect
6. Zoning Administrator Minutes for February 11, 2004 and February 25, 2004
7. Letters from the Public
8. Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration
9. Tentative Map
10. Resolution for Planned Unit Development Permit with Recommended Conditions of Approval
11. Resolution for Tentative Map with Recommended Conditions of Approval

cc: Granada Park Townhomes, LLC
777 North First Street, Fifth Floor
San Jose, CA 95112-6303

Mr. Bill Maston
384 Castro Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

Mr. Verne Robinson

AGENDA: March 23, 2004

PAGE: 9

203-1/2 Granada Drive
Mountain View, CA 94043

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW
RESOLUTION NO.
SERIES 2004

A RESOLUTION CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A PLANNED UNIT
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR A 20-UNIT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT
WITH A 0.55 FAR AT 203-233 GRANADA DRIVE

WHEREAS, an application was received from Granada Park Townhomes, LLC, for a Planned Unit Development Permit to construct a 20-unit townhouse development at 203-233 Granada Drive (Application No. 159-03-PUD); and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Administrator held public hearings on February 11, 2004 and February 25, 2004 on said application and recommended that the City Council approve the Planned Unit Development Permit with a 0.55 FAR, subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained in the Findings Report; and

WHEREAS, on March 23, 2004, the City Council held a public hearing on said application and received and considered all evidence presented at said hearing, including the Findings Report and staff report from the Zoning Administrator; and

WHEREAS, staff has determined that this project will not have a significant impact on the environment as described in the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council hereby finds and determines that this project will not have a significant impact on the environment and hereby adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration, which is incorporated by reference herein;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that said project, as conditioned, is consistent with the General Plan and the City's Zoning Ordinance;

TIME FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW:

The time within which judicial review of this document must be sought is governed by California Code of Procedure, Section 1094.6, as established by Resolution No. 13850, adopted by the City Council on August 9, 1983.

MA/9/RESO
891-03-08-04R-E^

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW
RESOLUTION NO.
SERIES 2004

A RESOLUTION CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A TENTATIVE MAP TO
SUBDIVIDE TWO EXISTING LOTS TOTALING 76,956 SQUARE FEET INTO
20 RESIDENTIAL LOTS AND ONE LOT FOR A COMMON DRIVEWAY,
GUEST PARKING AND COMMON LANDSCAPED AREA AT
203-233 GRANADA DRIVE

WHEREAS, an application was received from Granada Park Townhomes, LLC, for a tentative subdivision map to subdivide two existing lots totaling 76,956 square feet into 20 residential lots and 1 lot for a common driveway, guest parking and common landscaped area at 203-233 Granada Drive in the R3-1.5 Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, the Subdivision Committee considered the request at their meeting of March 1, 2004 and has recommended that the tentative map be approved subject to the attached conditions; and

WHEREAS, on March 23, 2004, the City Council held a public hearing on said application and received and considered all evidence presented at said hearing, including a February 25, 2004 report from the Zoning Administrator;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Mountain View finds and determines that this project will not have a significant effect on the environment and hereby approves the Mitigated Negative Declaration, which is incorporated by reference herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act, the City Council hereby finds that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the General Plan of the City, the Design Guidelines for Townhouse Developments and with the provisions of the R3 Zoning District.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council hereby finds that the establishment, maintenance and operation of the uses applied for will not, under the circumstances of this particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of said proposed use or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that as a finding of fact in support of its decision in this matter, this body incorporates, by reference, the Zoning Administrator's February 25, 2004 report and the approved minutes of this body's public hearing on March 23, 2004, and the comments made at such hearing when this matter was considered.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said application is hereby approved, and the tentative map for said project is hereby granted subject to the developer's fulfillment of each and all of the conditions which are attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

TIME FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW:

The time within which judicial review of this document must be sought is governed by California Code of Procedure, Section 1094.6, as established by Resolution No. 13850, adopted by the City Council on August 9, 1983.

MA/9/RESO
891-03-08-04R-E-1^